DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 335 501 CE 058 664

AUTHOR Greenberg, Mark; And Others
TITLE JOBS in the South: A Review of Initial State Data. State Profiles. Statistics Related to JOBS Implementation in the South.
INSTITUTION Center for Law and Social Policy, Washington, DC.; Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Mar 91
NOTE 29p.; Paper prepared for "JOBS and Education in the South: New Linkages, New Issues" (Atlanta, GA, March 25-26, 1991). For a related document, see CE 058 665.
AVAILABLE FROM Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, 777 North Capitol Street, N.E., Suite 705, Washington, DC 20002 ($3.00 each).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Basic Education; Basic Skills; *Employment Programs; Federal Aid; Federal Programs; *Job Training; Postsecondary Education; Program Effectiveness; *Program Implementation; Research Problems; Secondary Education; *State Programs; *Welfare Recipients
IDENTIFIERS *Job Opportunities in the Business Sector; *United States (South)

ABSTRACT

JOBS (Job Opportunities in the Business Sector) participation data from federal reports for December 1990 were reviewed for 9 of the 10 states of the South (Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee). Kentucky information was not available at the time of review. Although federal reporting has its problems (such as using 1 month as typical, failing to describe what "participation" involves, the way in which data are requested, and states' own perceptions of inaccuracy in their data), it is the only available source of statistics. A number of inferences were drawn from the study: (1) the number of participants in components is a small fraction of the number of adult welfare recipients in most Southern states; (2) education below the postsecondary level is the largest activity in most Southern states; (3) the size of the skills training and job readiness components varies considerably from state to state; (4) a sizable percentage of participants are in postsecondary activities; (5) job search is not a large program component; (6) there is almost no involvement in on-the-job training and work supplementation; (7) most states do not have substantial participation in work experience programs; (8) the first states to implement JOBS in the South have varied widely in the extent to which they draw available federal funds; (9) a significant portion of JOBS spending is going to assessment costs; and (10) there is great variation in the numbers of participants receiving child care assistance. (Statistical profiles are provided for the 10 states.) (KC)

ED335501

JOBS IN THE SOUTH
A Review of Initial State Data

by
Mark Greenberg, Julie Strawn
and Sam Stephenson

STATE PROFILES
Statistics Related to JOBS Implementation in the South

Prepared for

JOBS and Education in the South:

New Linkages, New Issues

March 25-26, 1991
Decatur Holiday Inn
Atlanta, Georgia

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Sponsored by
The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities
The Center for Law and Social Policy

CE 054 664

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In preparation for our conference, **JOBS and Education in the South: New Linkages, New Issues,** we reviewed JOBS participation data from federal reports for the most recent available month — December 1990 — for nine of the ten states involved in the conference.[1] We sought to look both at the numbers of people participating in JOBS and the nature of activities in which people are participating.

There are problems with relying on federal reporting to describe the program, for several reasons:

- The federal reports offer a "snapshot" of what people did in the program that month. This may or may not offer a good picture of experiences over time. For example, a state may show 20 participants in education, and 10 in job search each month. The same 20 people may be in education throughout the year, while 10 different people go to job search each month. At the end of the year, there will have been 20 people who participated in education, and 120 who participated in job search, even though the education component always appeared larger on a monthly basis. Accordingly, looking at monthly figures does not necessarily tell us what the typical program experience is like.

- The federal reports tell us the numbers of people in JOBS components, but give no real sense of what that participation involves. For example, we can say what number or percentage of participants are in education below the postsecondary level, but it is not possible to use the federal reports to know how much involves basic education classes, GED programs, high school, alternative programs, etc.

- There are some serious problems in using the federal reports because of the way in which data is requested and the lack of instructions for some key terms.[2] Because of the problems in the report form, each number below should be thought of as a ballpark figure rather than a precise description.

- A number of states are concerned about the accuracy of their own data reporting, and urge caution or discourage reliance on the existing reports.

---

[1] The ten states are Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee. Due to data collection problems, Kentucky could not make its numbers available at this time.

[2] For a detailed discussion of these problems, see Greenberg, *What's Happening in JOBS: A Review of Initial State Data* (September 1990), available from CLASP.

Despite these concerns, the federal reporting is, at present, the only available source of numbers from which one can make statements about what is happening to people in JOBS. In reviewing the available reports, we found:

- The number of participants in components is a small fraction of the number of adult recipients in most Southern states. We make a number of statements based on the percentages of participants in components, but it is important to keep in mind that the actual number of people is often quite small.

- Education below the postsecondary level is the largest activity in most Southern states.

- The size of the skills training and job readiness components vary considerably from state to state.

- In most Southern JOBS programs, a sizeable percentage of participants is being allowed to participate or continue in postsecondary activities.

- Job search is not a large program component in most of the states of the region.

- There is almost no involvement in on-the-job training and work supplementation.

- Most states do not have substantial participation in work experience at this point, but a different trend could develop over time.

- The first states to implement JOBS in the South have varied widely in the extent to which they drew down available federal funds.

- A significant portion of JOBS spending is going to assessment costs, but it is hard to draw many more conclusions about the nature of JOBS spending.

- Within the region, there is tremendous variation in the numbers of participants receiving child care assistance, and in the amount of assistance being provided.

The following text explains each point and notes some implications.

The number of participants in components is a small fraction of the number of adult recipients in most Southern states.

We compared the number of adult recipients with the number of persons participating in a component. Only Arkansas reached 30%; the number was less than five percent in six of the nine states.

Table I
Adult AFDC Recipients and JOBS Participants

State	Adult Recipients (Nov 90)	Participants (Dec 1990) in a Component
Alabama	46,200	1,813
Arkansas	25,200	8,002
Florida	150,100	19,018
Georgia	109,100	6,520
Louisiana	91,700	340
Mississippi	58,700	140
North Carolina	95,500	1,598
South Carolina	41,000	1,937
Tennessee	81,700	380

In looking at these numbers, it is important to keep in mind that:

- The program had just begun in October in four of the nine states, and numbers will be going up over the year; further, we look at activities after assessment, so are not counting the number of people in a pre-component activity;

- A high participation rate should **not** be viewed as the best measure of program performance; a state may conclude that for a program with extremely limited resources, the best approach is to limit participants and ensure that higher quality services are provided per participant;

- Our chart does not reflect or even suggest what a state's participation rate might be for purposes of federal participation rates. Because of the many rules governing how participation rates are calculated, there may be little or no relation between the number of participants and the participation rate in the state.[3]

[3] For a more detailed discussion of this point, see Greenberg, *Participation Rates in the JOBS Program* (May 1990); Greenberg, *The New Math: Calculating JOBS Participation Rates* (December 1990).

Despite these qualifications, the low numbers of participants in most Southern states does have the following implications:

- Most Southern states are still at the earliest stages of directing AFDC recipients to JOBS activities;

- For most recipients, participation in JOBS is still an unlikely occurrence, and the nature of receiving AFDC has not changed in any fundamental way.

The remainder of this section focuses on what people are actually doing in their JOBS component activity. The discussion may help suggest early indications about the tone of state programs, but it is important to keep in mind that at present, most people are not getting access to any services at all.

Education below the postsecondary level is the largest activity in most Southern states.

In six of the nine states (all except FL, GA and LA), education below postsecondary has the most participants of any component.

Table II
Education Below Postsecondary

State	% Participants in December 1990
Mississippi	52
Alabama	48
Tennessee	46
South Carolina	43
North Carolina	41
Arkansas	34
Georgia	31
Louisiana	28
Florida	18

In one sense, this may not be a surprise because of the extent of educational needs among AFDC recipients in the South. However, in a larger sense, this represents a fundamental shift from pre-JOBS work-welfare programs. For state JOBS Programs, it strongly suggests:

- the importance of developing a clear understanding of what happens when someone is sent to education; of developing standards for measuring quality of educational activities, educational gains and outcomes, and appropriate exit criteria; and of developing procedures to address problems and disputes around participation in education;

- the importance of assuring public and legislative understanding that the biggest activity in JOBS is education, and the program should be viewed, provided funding support, and evaluated in that light.

The size of the skills training and job readiness components vary considerably from state to state.

There is tremendous variation in the amount of skills training and job readiness reported.

Table III
Skills Training

State	% of Participants in December 1990
Alabama	22
Louisiana	13
Tennessee	13
Arkansas	12
Georgia	12
South Carolina	9
North Carolina	7
Florida	6
Mississippi	1

Table IV
Job Readiness

State	% of Participants in December 1990
Tennessee	19
North Carolina	14
Louisiana	10
Arkansas	9
South Carolina	8
Georgia	5
Florida	4
Alabama	2
Mississippi	2

It is difficult to draw conclusions from these numbers because states may be reporting them differently. Nationally, some states appear to report skills training in postsecondary institutions as "skills training," and others as "postsecondary

education." Similarly, some states appear to report job readiness activities tied to assessment or job search as "job readiness" and others as assessment or job search.

In most Southern JOBS programs, a sizeable percentage of participants is being allowed to participate or continue in postsecondary activities.

Under federal law, states have two basic choices about approving postsecondary education as a JOBS activity:

- If the individual is not currently participating in postsecondary education, the state may choose to permit the activity as a JOBS activity; the state may or may not choose to pay for the costs of the education;

- If the individual is already participating in postsecondary education on her own at the time she is scheduled to begin JOBS participation, the state can approve the activity as "self-initiated activity", count it as a JOBS activity, but may not pay the costs of the education.

In either case, if the activity is approved as a JOBS activity, the state is required to guarantee child care and provide necessary transportation and other supportive services.

Every Southern state has opted to permit postsecondary education and self-initiated activity under some circumstances. Spending on postsecondary education is typically very low: it only exceeds 10% of component spending in Georgia (63%), North Carolina (26%) and Arkansas (12%). This may reflect that typically a state may be directing participants to sources of financial aid for postsecondary education, but is not directly funding it as a JOBS activity.

Since there may be little practical difference between "postsecondary" and "self-initiated", it may help to look at the two activities together to get a sense of the extent to which a program permits and supports postsecondary education.

Postsecondary education could involve some mix of community colleges, four year institutions, and proprietary schools, but the total participation figures do not give a sense of what that mix is.

Table V
Postsecondary Education and Self-Initiated Activities

State	% of Participants in December 1990	
	Postsecondary Education	Self-Initiated Activities
Georgia	38	0
North Carolina	25	5
Florida	14	1
Arkansas	12	17
Louisiana	9	34
Mississippi	8	18
Alabama	6	16
South Carolina	5	1
Tennessee	4	14

Job search is not a large program component in most states of the region.

States vary significantly in the use of job search; it is the major component activity in one state, but involves 6% or less of participants in most states of the region.

Table VI
Job Search

State	% of Participants in December 1990
Florida	55
South Carolina	25
Mississippi	15
Georgia	12
Arkansas	6
Louisiana	6
Alabama	4
North Carolina	4
Tennessee	<1

The fact that job search is not a substantial component in most states is in sharp contrast with many work-welfare programs of the 1980s. It appears to reflect the commitment of many states to a new emphasis on education before, or in lieu of job search.

There is almost no involvement in on-the-job training and work supplementation.

Under federal law, a state may use JOBS funds to purchase on-the-job training slots. The state may also use AFDC and JOBS funds to subsidize the cost of wages paid to an AFDC recipient by an employer through "work supplementation."

At this point, there is virtually no use of either component in most Southern states.

Table VII
On-the-Job Training and Work Supplementation

State	% of Participants in December 1990	
	On-the-Job Training	Work Supplementation
Alabama	0	0
Arkansas	1	0
Florida	<1	<1
Georgia	<1	0
Louisiana	<1	0
Mississippi	0	0
North Carolina	<1	0
South Carolina	<1	0
Tennessee	3	0

These low numbers may partially reflect the new emphasis on education in state programs, and the extent to which state programs may be relying on referrals to programs available without cost in the community. However, given the close connection between JOBS and JTPA programs in many states, it is puzzling why there are not a greater number of JTPA/OJT slots being made available to JOBS participants.

Most states do not have substantial participation in work experience at this point, but a different trend could develop over time.

Under federal law, a state has two ways in which it may provide a work experience (unpaid work) component:

- The state may operate a community work experience program (CWEP) in which a participant's hours of unpaid work are limited by a formula based on the family's AFDC grant, less child support paid for the family, divided by the minimum wage; or

- The state may seek HHS approval to provide an "other work experience program" under whatever terms HHS approves.

A number of Southern states attained HHS approval for "other" work experience programs. According to JOBS state plans, the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Mississippi, and South Carolina all have some type of "other" work experience program.

Unfortunately, it is impossible to tell how many people are participating in these "other" work experience programs, because they are simply listed for federal reporting purposes as being in the category of "other." Accordingly, the most we can do is look at the total of CWEP and "other activities" as reflecting the maximum possible number in work experience programs:

Table VIII
CWEP and Other Approved Activities

State	% of Participants in December 1990	
	CWEP	Other Approved Activities
Alabama	0	<1
Arkansas	0	10
Florida	<1	1
Georgia	2	<1
Louisiana	0	0
Mississippi	0	3
North Carolina	5	0
South Carolina	0	8
Tennessee	0	0

Historically, "work experience" has been highly controversial because of concerns that individuals are simply being required to work without pay. The contention has been that persons lacking education or skills should be provided education or skills training, and those with sufficient skills should be helped to find unsubsidized employment. Concern about the role of work experience will likely be heightened if states begin to make use of programs mandating twenty or more hours of unpaid work each week. However, at this point, it does not appear that there is such extensive use of the component in most states.

The first states to implement JOBS in the South have varied widely in the extent to which they drew down available federal funds.

Under the Family Support Act, states were free to begin JOBS implementation on July 1, 1989, or any subsequent quarter. All states had to

begin implementation by October 1, 1990. Southern states ranged from beginning implementation at the first possible date to beginning at the last possible date:

Table IX
Date of JOBS Implementation

State	Implementation Date
Alabama	April 1990
Arkansas	July 1989
Florida	October 1989
Georgia	July 1989
Kentucky	October 1990
Louisiana	October 1990
Mississippi	October 1990
North Carolina	October 1990
South Carolina	October 1989
Tennessee	October 1990

When the state began implementation, it was eligible to draw down its share of the federal allocation, under a matching rate formula. The federal matching funds rates for JOBS and Child Care depend, in part, on state per capita income. Southern states have among the most favorable federal match rates in the country.

Table X
Federal Match Rates for Child Care

State	Federal Match Rate for JOBS Program AFDC Child Care Costs FY 1991
Arkansas	75.12
Florida	60 (JOBS); 54.46 (child care)
Georgia	61.34
Kentucky	72.96
Louisiana	74.48
Mississippi	79.93
North Carolina	66.60
South Carolina	72.58
Tennessee	68.57

Despite these match rates, Southern states have not yet been able to fully draw down their available federal funds. Of the five states operating programs

last year, only Arkansas was able to draw down an amount approaching its capped entitlement, and only Arkansas and Florida were able to draw down at least half of their available funds.

Table XI
Federal Jobs Spending by States Operating Programs in FY 90

State	Funds Available	Funds Claimed	% Claimed
Alabama	4,085,415	768,105	19
Arkansas	4,476,864	4,249,080	95
Florida	19,194,698	12,379,819	64.5
Georgia	16,909,808	5,975,555	35
S. Carolina	6,636,427	3,142,246	47

The level of uptake of federal funds for the region, at least in FY 90, was comparable to non-Southern states. The five states averaged claiming 52% of available federal JOBS funds; the other thirty jurisdictions operating JOBS in FY 90 averaged claiming 50%.

There is not yet available data from which to analyze FY 91. There are several reasons not to rely on FY 90 data for making projections for FY 91:

- The total federal amount available went up from $800,000,000 to $1 billion; we do not know how that will affect state matching behavior;
- The states that did not begin operating JOBS until October 1, 1990 reflect a mix of states that had extensive pre-JOBS programs, states that wanted to use all available time for a thoughtful planning process, and states that waited until the last possible time for a range of other reasons. The newly entering states may look very different than the previously established states;
- The majority of states are now facing substantial fiscal stress; since the JOBS "mandate" may be more flexible than that of other programs, JOBS may be significantly affected by budget shortfalls in some states.

Based on the limited draw-down of JOBS funds, it seems clear that the attractive match rates, in themselves, are not sufficient to assure full utilization of available funds. However, if legislatures can begin to perceive JOBS as an opportunity to access federal funds for education, training, and economic development, the favorable match rates could be part of a compelling argument for state fiscal commitment.

A significant portion of JOBS spending is going to assessment costs, but it is hard to draw many more conclusions about the nature of JOBS spending.

From existing data, it is impossible to say much about how JOBS funds are being spent or about expenditures per participant. The federal reporting form asks states to identify spending by component, but draws no distinction between spending on a component and spending on a supportive service like transportation for attending the component. Similarly, the form draws no distinction between case manager time in connection with the component activity and the actual cost of purchasing a slot. Further, when a state reflects little spending in a component, it is not possible to know whether a state is making effective use of referrals to community services, or just relying on very inexpensive services.

With these caveats, we looked at state reports breaking down total spending for December 1990, and found that a number of states are reporting a considerable amount of spending for assessment.

Table XII
Spending for Assessment

State	% of Total JOBS Spending for Assessment
Mississippi	93
Alabama	48
Tennessee	46
Louisiana	30
North Carolina	28
South Carolina	22
Florida	17
Arkansas	9
Georgia	2

This may reflect in part that some state programs are in an early stage where assessments must be performed before people can participate in component activities; the four states with the lowest percentage of spending on assessment are all states that began their programs in 1989. It may also reflect initial reliance on referrals to community services, so that much of the out-of-pocket cost for JOBS involves assessment and supportive services. In any case, the magnitude of expenditures for pre-component activities suggest the importance of assuring that these funds are being well-spent in helping to link people with the most appropriate individual employability plans.

It is harder to make inferences about other JOBS spending because of reporting limits. Some states appear to have simply allocated their expenditure

data to correspond to their participant data (i.e., if the state reports "x"% of people in a component, the state reports the same percentage as spending for that component). However, among states that did not take that approach, we noted:

- In some cases, the state has far more participants in education than program spending for education. In other cases, the opposite pattern occurs. For example, South Carolina has 43% of participants, but only 26% of component spending in education. In contrast, Florida has 18% of participants, and 27% of spending, in education.

- In most states, the percentage of expenditures for postsecondary education and self-initiated activity is far below the number of participants in those activities. For example, Louisiana reports 43% of participants in the two components, but no spending; Florida reports 15% of participants, but only 3% of JOBS spending. In contrast, Georgia reports 38% of participants and fully 63% of spending.

- Spending for the combination of on-the-job training and work supplementation typically does not exceed 1% of total component spending.

Finally, it is clear from spending data that some states in the region are operating at a fundamentally different scale than others. In December 1990, we see the following contrast:

Table XIII
JOBS Spending

State	Total JOBS Spending	Spending on Components (Excluding Assessment)
Alabama	336,388	265,973
Arkansas	475,285	322,731
Florida	1,892,507	1,562,185
Georgia	825,889	809,372
Louisiana	347,049	8,494
Mississippi	71,265	4,907
North Carolina	832,547	602,879
South Carolina	876,861	679,843
Tennessee	35,927	19,283

Within the region, there is tremendous variation in the numbers of participants receiving child care assistance, and in the amount of assistance being provided.

For many participants, the provision of child care may be the most important reason for participating in JOBS. Particularly where the state is primarily relying on available community resources for component activities, the provision of child care may be the one portion of the program that the individual could not have done on her own.

Unfortunately, when using the federal report forms, it is not possible to figure out how many JOBS participants are receiving child care assistance. The state must report the total number of AFDC recipients receiving child care, but that will include employed recipients and may include people receiving care in non-JOBS parts of the state. In lieu of saying nothing, we use the approach of comparing the total number of families receiving AFDC child care with the total number assisted by JOBS. For example, if 60 families are receiving child care assistance, and 100 are being assisted by JOBS, we use a figure of 60%. This overstates the number of JOBS families receiving child care, but we at least know that no more than 60% of JOBS families are receiving care.

States are eligible for unlimited federal child care matching funding, at the state's Medicaid match rate. Given the favorable match rates for Southern states, JOBS implementation could function as a time to access federal funds to expand the state's ability to provide child care. When we look at spending to date, we see a broad range of responses.

Table XIV
Child Care Spending

State	Child Care Spending	Average Monthly Cost per Child (Including Transitional)
Alabama	334,204	135
Arkansas	187,357	54
Florida	837,611	133
Georgia	1,516,816	189
Louisiana	62,540	60
Mississippi	22,573	138
North Carolina	134,443	135
South Carolina	34,398	112
Tennessee	198,279	112

Some of the variation may relate to the stage of JOBS implementation, but the sharp contrasts strongly suggest that differences in state administrative and

payment practices are accounting for at least part of the difference in child care performance.

Table XV
Child Care Provided

State	Families Receiving Child Care (Excluding TCC)	As % of Families Assisted by JOBS
Alabama	1,828	80
Arkansas	2,337	20
Florida	N/A	N/A
Georgia	3,404	52
Louisiana	18	1
Mississippi	5	1
North Carolina	3,308	166
South Carolina	155	6
Tennessee	163	29

CONCLUSIONS

The review of JOBS data for the South confirms two themes about early implementation of the program:

- Even in a region where states share a number of common characteristics, there is substantial variation in almost every feature of the JOBS Program;

- There has been a major shift to a new and expanded role for basic education in work-welfare efforts. Given the size of the education component in the Southern states, the South's experiences are likely to be a principal source of information about what does and does not work in initial welfare-education linkages.

STATE PROFILES

Statistics Related to JOBS Implementation in the South

Prepared for

JOBS and Education in the South:

New Linkages, New Issues

March 25-26, 1991
Decatur Holiday Inn
Atlanta, Georgia

Sponsored by

The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities
The Center for Law and Social Policy

STATE PROFILE FOR ALABAMA

JOBS Program name:	**JOBS**
Starting date:	April, 1990
Statewide:	No; 13 counties[1]

Background Characteristics

Unemployment rate, 1990[2]	6.8%
Poverty rate, 1986-88 (national rank)[3]	21.6% (48)
% of Heads of Household With Less Than HS Diploma, 1986-88 (national rank for HS graduates)[4]	38% (50)
% With 0-8 Years of Schooling	19%
% With 9-11 Years of Schooling	19%
Total Adult AFDC Recipients, November, 1990[5]	46,200
AFDC-UP Program Prior to October 1, 1990	No
AFDC Maximum Benefit for Family of Three, January, 1991[6]	$124

Adult Education Data, 1988-89[7]

Total Enrollment	37,154
Total Spending	$4,474,780
Federal expenditures	$2,142,736
State and/or local expenditures	$2,332,044
State and/or local share of total spending (national rank)	52.12% (29)
Expenditure per student	$120

JOBS Program Data[8]

FY 90	Federal JOBS Funds Available	$4,085,415
	Total Federal Funds (FFP) Claimed	$768,105
FY 90	Federal JOBS/AFDC Child Care Claimed	$210,148
FY 91	Federal JOBS Funds Available[9]	$9,982,721

STATE PROFILE FOR ARKANSAS

JOBS Program name:	**Project Success**
Starting date:	July, 1989
Statewide:	Yes[1]

Background Characteristics

Unemployment rate, 1990[2]	6.9%
Poverty rate, 1986-88 (national rank)[3]	21.8% (49)
% of Heads of Household With Less Than HS Diploma, 1986-88 (national rank for HS graduates)[4]	35% (46)
% With 0-8 Years of Schooling	19%
% With 9-11 Years of Schooling	16%
Total Adult AFDC Recipients, November, 1990[5]	25,200
AFDC-UP Program Prior to October 1, 1990	No
AFDC Maximum Benefit for Family of Three, January, 1991[6]	$204

Adult Education Data, 1988-89[7]

Total Enrollment	24,182
Total Spending	$8,038,852
Federal expenditures	$1,397,350
State and/or local expenditures	$6,541,502
State and/or local share of total spending (national rank)	82.6% (14)
Expenditure per student	$306

JOBS Program Data[8]

FY 90	Federal JOBS Funds Available	$4,476,864
	Total Federal Funds (FFP) Claimed	$4,249,080
FY 90	Federal JOBS/AFDC Child Care Claimed	$2,215,262
FY 91	Federal JOBS Funds Available[9]	$5,532,476

STATE PROFILE FOR FLORIDA

JOBS Program name:	**Project Independence**
Starting date:	July 1989
Statewide:	Yes[1]

Background Characteristics

Unemployment rate, 1990[2]	5.9%
Poverty rate, 1986-88 (national rank)[3]	12.5% (24)
% of Heads of Household With Less Than HS Diploma, 1986-88 (national rank for HS graduates)[4]	23% (23)
% With 0-8 Years of Schooling	11%
% With 9-11 Years of Schooling	12%
Total Adult AFDC Recipients, November, 1990[5]	150,100
AFDC-UP Program Prior to October 1, 1990	No
AFDC Maximum Benefit for Family of Three, January, 1991[6]	$294

Adult Education Data, 1988-89[7]

Total Enrollment	404,277
Total Spending	$50,320,174
Federal expenditures	$ 4,283,142
State and/or local expenditures	$46,037,032
State and/or local share of total spending (national rank)	91.49% (3)
Expenditure per student	$183

JOBS Program Data[8]

FY 90	Federal JOBS Funds Available	$19,164,696
	Total Federal Funds (FFP) Claimed	$12,379,819
FY 90	Federal JOBS/AFDC Child Care Claimed	$10,040,195
FY 91	Federal JOBS Funds Available[9]	$26,856,354

STATE PROFILE FOR GEORGIA

JOBS Program name:	**PEACH**
Starting date:	July, 1989
Statewide:	No; 33 cities[1]

Background Characteristics

Unemployment rate, 1990[2]	5.4%
Poverty rate, 1986-88 (national rank)[3]	14.4% (36)
% of Heads of Household With Less Than HS Diploma, 1986-88 (national rank for HS graduates)[4]	30% (41)
% With 0-8 Years of Schooling	15%
% With 9-11 Years of Schooling	15%
Total Adult AFDC Recipients, November, 1990[5]	109,100
AFDC-UP Program Prior to October 1, 1990	Yes
AFDC Maximum Benefit for Family of Three, January, 1991[6]	$280

Adult Education Data, 1988-89[7]

Total Enrollment	47,344
Total Spending	$5,375,706
Federal expenditures	$2,904,503
State and/or local expenditures	$2,471,203
State and/or local share of total spending (national rank)	45.97% (34)
Expenditure per student	$112

JOBS Program Data[8]

FY 90	Federal JOBS Funds Available	$16,909,808
	Total Federal Funds (FFP) Claimed	$5,975,555
FY 90	Federal JOBS/AFDC Child Care Claimed	$6,800,547
FY 91	Federal JOBS Funds Available	$22,693,881

STATE PROFILE FOR KENTUCKY

JOBS Program name:	**JOBS**
Starting date:	October, 1990
Statewide:	No; 18 cities[1]

Background Characteristics

Unemployment rate, 1990[2]	5.8%
Poverty rate, 1986-88 (national rank)[3]	17.8% (44)
% of Heads of Household With Less Than HS Diploma, 1986-88 (national rank for HS graduates)[4]	36% (47)
% With 0-8 Years of Schooling	23%
% With 9-11 Years of Schooling	13%
Total Adult AFDC Recipients, November, 1990[5]	73,600
AFDC-UP Program Prior to October 1, 1990	No
AFDC Maximum Benefit for Family of Three, January, 1991[6]	$228

Adult Education Data, 1988-89[7]

Total Enrollment	30,635
Total Spending	$2,359,130
Federal expenditures	$2,120,217
State and/or local expenditures	$ 238,913
State and/or local share of total spending (national rank)	10.13% (49)
Expenditure per student	$162

JOBS Program Data[8]

FY 90	Federal JOBS Funds Available	N/A
	Total Federal Funds (FFP) Claimed	N/A
FY 90	Federal JOBS/AFDC Child Care Claimed	N/A
FY 91	Federal JOBS Funds Available	$14,953,949

STATE PROFILE FOR LOUISIANA

JOBS Program name:	**Project Independence**
Starting date:	October, 1990
Statewide:	No; 10 parishes[1]

Background Characteristics

Unemployment rate, 1990[2]	6.2%
Poverty rate, 1986-88 (national rank)[3]	22.5% (50)
% of Heads of Household With Less Than HS Diploma, 1986-88 (national rank for HS graduates)[4]	32% (43)
% With 0-8 Years of Schooling	18%
% With 9-11 Years of Schooling	14%
Total Adult AFDC Recipients, November, 1990[5]	91,700
AFDC-UP Program Prior to October 1, 1990	No
AFDC Maximum Benefit for Family of Three, January, 1991[6]	$190

Adult Education Data, 1988-89[7]

Total Enrollment	41,103
Total Spending	$7,765,188
Federal expenditures	$1,967,895
State and/or local expenditures	$5,576,975
State and/or local share of total spending (national rank)	71.82% (19)
Expenditure per student	$142

JOBS Program Data[8]

FY 90	Federal JOBS Funds Available	N/A
	Total Federal Funds (FFP) Claimed	N/A
FY 90	Federal JOBS/AFDC Child Care Claimed	N/A
FY 91	Federal JOBS Funds Available[9]	$20,388,000

STATE PROFILE FOR MISSISSIPPI

JOBS Program name:	**JOBS**
Starting date:	July, 1990
Statewide:	No; 9 counties[1]

Background Characteristics

Unemployment rate, 1990[2]	7.5%
Poverty rate, 1986-88 (national rank)[3]	25.8% (51)
% of Heads of Household With Less Than HS Diploma, 1986-88 (national rank for HS graduates)[4]	37% (48)
% With 0-8 Years of Schooling	21%
% With 9-11 Years of Schooling	16%
Total Adult AFDC Recipients, November, 1990[5]	58,700
AFDC-UP Program Prior to October 1, 1990	No
AFDC Maximum Benefit for Family of Three, January, 1991[6]	$120

Adult Education Data, 1988-89[7]

Total Enrollment	16,520
Total Spending	$1,644,791
Federal expenditures	$1,487,288
State and/or local expenditures	$ 157,503
State and/or local share of total spending (national rank)	9.58% (51)
Expenditure per student	$100

JOBS Program Data[8]

FY 90	Federal JOBS Funds Available	N/A
	Total Federal Funds (FFP) Claimed	N/A
FY 90	Federal JOBS/AFDC Child Care Claimed	N/A
FY 91	Federal JOBS Funds Available[9]	$12,732,546

STATE PROFILE FOR NORTH CAROLINA

JOBS Program name:	**JOBS**
Starting date:	October, 1990
Statewide:	No[1]

Background Characteristics

Unemployment rate, 1990[2]	4.1%
Poverty rate, 1986-88 (national rank)[3]	13.7% (35)
% of Heads of Household With Less Than HS Diploma, 1986-88 (national rank for HS graduates)[4]	33% (44)
% With 0-8 Years of Schooling	17%
% With 9-11 Years of Schooling	16%
Total Adult AFDC Recipients, November, 1990[5]	95,500
AFDC-UP Program Prior to October 1, 1990	Yes
AFDC Maximum Benefit for Family of Three, January, 1991[6]	$272

Adult Education Data, 1988-89[7]

Total Enrollment	101,401
Total Spending	$19,143,250
Federal expenditures	$ 3,223,762
State and/or local expenditures	$15,919,488
State and/or local share of total spending (national rank)	83.16% (11)
Expenditure per student	$182

JOBS Program Data[8]

FY 90	Federal JOBS Funds Available	N/A
	Total Federal Funds (FFP) Claimed	N/A
FY 90	Federal JOBS/AFDC Child Care Claimed	N/A
FY 91	Federal JOBS Funds Available[9]	$18,691,688

STATE PROFILE FOR SOUTH CAROLINA

JOBS Program name:	**Work Support Services Program**
Starting date:	October, 1989
Statewide:	No[1]

Background Characteristics

Unemployment rate, 1990[2]	4.7%
Poverty rate, 1986-88 (national rank)[3]	16.0% (40)
% of Heads of Household With Less Than HS Diploma, 1986-88 (national rank for HS graduates)[4]	35% (45)
% With 0-8 Years of Schooling	19%
% With 9-11 Years of Schooling	16%
Total Adult AFDC Recipients, November, 1990[5]	41,000
AFDC-UP Program Prior to October 1, 1990	Yes
AFDC Maximum Benefit for Family of Three, January, 1991[6]	$210

Adult Education Data, 1988-89[7]

Total Enrollment	74,614
Total Spending	$6,782,027
Federal expenditures	$1,823,605
State and/or local expenditures	$4,958,422
State and/or local share of total spending (national rank)	73.1% (17)
Expenditure per student	$100

JOBS Program Data[8]

FY 90	Federal JOBS Funds Available	$6,636,427
	Total Federal Funds (FFP) Claimed	$3,142,246
FY 90	Federal JOBS/AFDC Child Care Claimed	$ 93,619
FY 91	Federal JOBS Funds Available[9]	$8,291,401

STATE PROFILE FOR TENNESSEE

JOBS Program name:	**JOBS**
Starting date:	October 1990
Statewide:	Yes[1]

Background Characteristics

Unemployment rate, 1990[2]	5.2%
Poverty rate, 1986-88 (national rank)[3]	18.4% (45)
% of Heads of Household With Less Than HS Diploma, 1986-88 (national rank for HS graduates)[4]	37% (49)
% With 0-8 Years of Schooling	24%
% With 9-11 Years of Schooling	13%
Total Adult AFDC Recipients, November, 1990[5]	81,700
AFDC-UP Program Prior to October 1, 1990	No
AFDC Maximum Benefit for Family of Three, January, 1991[6]	$195

Adult Education Data, 1988-89[7]

Total Enrollment	28,320
Total Spending	$2,702,533
Federal expenditures	$2,226,853
State and/or local expenditures	$ 475,860
State and/or local share of total spending (national rank)	17.60% (45)
Expenditure per student	$97

JOBS Program Data[8]

FY 90	Federal JOBS Funds Available	N/A
	Total Federal Funds (FFP) Claimed	N/A
FY 90	Federal JOBS/AFDC Child Care Claimed	N/A
FY 91	Federal JOBS Funds Available[9]	$17,112,901

Notes

1. Summary of JOBS Program prepared by FSA/OFA/JOBS Task Force, U.S. Dept of Health and Human Services, 1/31/91.

2. "State and Regional Unemployment in 1990", USDL 91-74, Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor.

3. Analysis of Census data from the Current Population Survey, prepared by Jon Haveman and Sheldon Danziger for the Corporation for Enterprise Development, Washington, DC. National rankings include the District of Columbia.

4. Ibid. National rankings are based on the proportion of heads of household in the state who are high school graduates, in descending order.

5. Family Support Administration, U.S. Dept. of Health and Human Services, 2/11/91.

6. Congressional Research Service, January 1991.

7. Office of Vocational and Adult Education, U.S. Dept. of Education, January 1991. One measure of level of effort in adult education is the extent to which a state commits funding to the program beyond the minimal (10% in 1988-89) state/local match required under the Adult Education Act. National rank indicates how states compare under this measure of level of effort.

8. Summary prepared by OFA/FSA from FSA-331 forms, as submitted by the States, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1/9/91. The total FFP claimed for FY 90 may rise as unliquidated obligations are spent; states have two years in which to file claims.

9. JOBS-FSA-IM-91-1, Family Support Administration February 1, 1991.

10. Calculations derived from the numbers reported on FSA-104 forms, First Quarter 1991, as submitted by States. For North Carolina, the December 104 form actually reflects November participation.

11. Ibid.

12. Ibid. For Florida, child care participation data is not included because the data currently in the system lags far behind actual participation.